AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Please add Fig. 1F, and add element reference numerals 5.3 and 6.3, and the corresponding elements, to Fig. 1A, as shown in the Replacement Sheet.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

There is no additional fee for this Amendment because the total number of claims has been reduced and the total number of independent claims remains unchanged.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned, to schedule a telephone interview to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to Drawings

The drawings have been amended by adding to Fig. 1A element reference numerals 5.3 and 6.3 and the corresponding elements, and by adding Fig. 1F, which shows an electric pump that can be attached to the connecting sleeve. This Amendment is fully supported in the Substitute Specification, at Page 11, line 3 through Page 12, line 12, and Page 13, lines 12-15, and by Claims 8 and 11. This Amendment adds no new matter.

Amendment to Specification

The Substitute Specification has been amended at Page 9, by adding a description of Fig. 1F. This Amendment adds no new matter.

Amendment to Claims

Each of independent Claims 1, 34, 38 and 41 has been amended by adding the limitations of Claim 32. Claim 1 now represents the independent form of Claim 32.

Applicant has canceled Claim 32 in view of the above Amendment to Claim 1. This Amendment adds no new matter.

Claims and Drawings Objections

Claims 8 and 11 have been objected to because the drawings do not show an electric pump. Applicant has added Fig. 1F, which shows an electric pump that can be connected to the connecting sleeve. Applicant believes that the Amendment to the drawings overcomes the objection to Claims 8 and 11 and also overcomes the objection to the drawings.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 24, 25, 34 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as anticipated by Bachman et al., U.S. Patent 5,843,029. This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks.

At Page 5 of the Office Action, in the second paragraph, the Examiner states that the Bachman et al. Patent does not include a spiral spring and top cover tension system. Applicant agrees that the Bachman et al. Patent fails to teach such limitation.

Furthermore, because Applicant has added the limitation of Claim 32 to independent Claim 1, Applicant believes that the above Amendment overcomes the rejection of each of Claims 1, 24 and 25, as being anticipated by the Bachman et al. Patent. Likewise, Applicant has added a limitation to independent Claim 34. Thus, Applicant believes that the above Amendment overcomes the rejection of Claims 34 and 35 as being anticipated by Bachman et al. Patent.

Claim 41 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Samson, U.S. Patent 5,415,632. Page 4 of the Office Action appears to contain a typographical error because the Samson Patent Number is 5,415,632 and not 5,415,063.

Applicant has amended Claim 41 by adding the limitations for the snapin element to be snapped together with the attachment. The Samson Patent does not teach or even suggest a snap attachment, particularly as required by Applicant's Claim 41. Thus, Applicant believes that the above Amendment and remarks overcomes the rejection of Claim 41 as being anticipated by the Samson Patent.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-10, 26-33, 36, 37, 39, 40 and 42-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), for the reasons set forth at Pages 5-8 of the Office Action.

Applicant has amended each of independent Claims 1, 34, 38 and 41 to include the limitations of Claim 32.

Claim 32 is rejected as being obvious over the Bachman et al. Patent, in view of Williams et al., U.S. Patent 5,749,850. The Williams et al. Patent teaches a diaphragm type breast pump that has no cap element. Because the Williams et al. Patent does not teach or suggest how spring 32 and/or support element 36 could be modified to be combined with the teachings of the Bachman et al. Patent, Applicant believes that each of independent Claims 1, 34, 38 and 41, which contains the limitation of Claim 32, is not rendered obvious, particularly in the manner required under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicant believes that the Amendment to each of independent Claims 1, 34, 38 and 41 overcomes each rejection in view of all prior art references identified at Pages 5-8.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant understands that Claims 11-23 and 38 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Applicant believes that all remaining claims are now allowed over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the above Amendment and remarks address each and every issue raised by the Examiner and overcome each and every objection and rejection. However, should the Examiner detect any remaining issue, Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned, preferably by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas H Pauley

Registration No. 33,295

Pauley Petersen & Erickson 2800 West Higgins Road; Suite 365 Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169 TEL (847) 490-1400 FAX (847) 490-1403